

Capitol Planning Commission

Meeting Minutes

August 21, 2007, 2007

9:00 a.m. to Noon
Public Safety Building, Capitol Complex, Des Moines

This regular meeting of the Capitol Planning Commission was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Members Present

Brice Oakley, Chair	Molly Clause	Senator James Seymour
Catherine Brown, Vice-Chair	Scott Brown	Representative Ralph Watts
Paul Carlson, Secretary	Carl Voss	Representative Mark Davitt
		Senator Matt McCoy

Members Absent

Elizabeth Isaacson

Dept. of Administrative Services (DAS) Staff Present

Mollie Anderson, Director—DAS
Dean Ibsen—DAS, General Services Enterprise, Vertical Infrastructure Program
Nancy Williams—DAS, General Services Enterprise
Nicholas Smith—DAS, General Services Enterprise, Vertical Infrastructure Program
Deb Madison-Levi—DAS
Laura Riordan—DAS
Tera Granger—DAS
Lana Morrissey—DAS

Others Present for All or Portions of the Meeting

Jerry Addy—Workers Monument
Matt Carlile—Brian Clark & Associates
Patrick Alford—Jeffrey Morgan Architecture Studio
Joan Conrad—Dept. of Commerce, Iowa Utilities Board
Bill Dikis—Architectural Strategies
Todd Garner—Substance Architecture Interiors Design
Anna Hyatt-Crozier—House Democratic Staff
Theresa Kehoe—Senate Democrats
Dave Reynolds—Legislative Service Bureau
Eddie Sauls—Iowa Workforce Development
Bruce Williams—Dept. of Cultural Affairs, Iowa Arts Council
Joe Gardyas—Des Moines Business Record
Jon Roos—Des Moines Register
Richard Lee—WHO
Scott Weiser—Iowa Motor Truck Association
Brenda Neville—Iowa Motor Truck Association

Dan Manning—Connolly Law Firm
Karla Hansen—Caring Connections
Rev. Chet Guinn—Peace Makers Group
M.J. Dolan—Iowa Association of Community College Trustees
Jeffrey A. Krausman—Dickinson Law Firm
Donald L. Seymour—Durant Architects Engineers
Christopher Osore—Durrant Group

Summary of Proceedings

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brice Oakley at 9:00a.m.

Meeting Overview and Approval of Agenda – Action Item

The agenda was approved as presented.

Request for Comments during the Meeting

Chairman Oakley outlined procedures for receiving questions and comments during the meeting and for voting.

Approval of Minutes of July 18, 2007 Meeting

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved with minor corrections.

Staff Reports/Project Updates

Dean Ibsen presented a Power Point to the group, with photos of some of the work going on at the Capitol Complex presently.

East Steps of the Capitol

Windows on the East side of the Capitol

Parking Lot Work

Newly Funded Construction Projects

Electrical Distribution Project

Switchgear South of the Lucas Building

MOTION—Senator McCoy moved that DAS pursue options with Brian Clark & Associates and come back with some sort of recommendation, if it exceeds some amount to be determined, otherwise move forward with it. What is the amount? He asked that DAS pursue and explore all the options available to it. Chairman Oakley noted that a Commissioner has to make the motion. Molly Clause moved to make no specific recommendations but to defer to DAS to take into consideration what we have discussed today. Carl Voss seconded the motion. Molly Clause asked for a vote by Short Form. Motion carried.

New Office Buildings

Dean Ibsen provided brief updates on the new office building projects.

New Office Building/Mercy Capitol Acquisition

IUB/OCA Building Update

West Capitol Terrace

Dean Ibsen provided an update on upcoming phases of the West Capitol Terrace project.

Visitors' Center

Director Anderson provided an update on the proposed Visitors' Center for the complex.

Capitol Complex Master Plan

The need for an update to the Capitol Complex Master Plan was discussed.

Capitol Complex Monuments

An update on monuments was provided along with discussion on a proposed monuments policy.

Shattering Silence

Workers Monument

MOTION—Chairman Oakley moved that the Commission recommend proceeding with the site construction work. Part of the 28E Agreement would be that the State staff and Brian Clark & Associates staff would work together on the plan details of the site plan. Molly Clause seconded the motion. Vote – short form has been called for. Motion carried.

Monuments Master Plan Update

Capitol Requests/Five Year Modernization Plan for the Capitol Complex

The Dept. of Administrative Services' proposed Five Year Plan to be submitted was reviewed.

Iowa Association of Community College Trustees (IACCT) Building

IACCT presented design concepts for the proposed building.

MOTION—Scott Brown moved to defer on this until the next meeting in October unless there was a need to schedule a special meeting before that. Molly Clause stated she was not comfortable in waiting that long. Motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION—Carl Voss moved to approve the architectural rendering as presented. Paul Carlson seconded the motion. Cathy Brown asked for clarification. Carl clarified that his motion does not address a change in the site plan; the site plan would stand approved and that the commission is recommending approval of the architecture. Director Anderson asked that the second not come from DAS staff but from another Commission member. Paul Carlson withdrew his second. Molly Clause seconded the motion with a friendly amendment asking the two parties to work together on this with a serious timeframe stipulation. Carl Voss noted he was okay with one week.

After some discussion, roll call vote. Motion carried.

MOTION—Molly Clause moved to reconsider the previous motion. Paul Carlson seconded the motion. Roll call vote. Motion carried.

MOTION—Cathy Brown moved to reconvene between the 4th and the 11th of September for the purpose of consideration of this agenda item. Scott Brown seconded the motion. Roll call vote. Motion carried.

Adjourn

Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brice Oakley at 9:00a.m.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Brice Oakley at 9:00 a.m., followed by roll call by Nancy Williams and introductions.

Meeting Overview and Approval of Agenda – Action Item

The agenda was approved as presented.

Chairman Oakley asked for any additions or corrections to the agenda, hearing none, agenda approved. Member Molly Clause noted she really liked the detail of the agenda.

Request for Comments during the Meeting

Chairman Oakley outlined procedures for receiving questions and comments during the meeting and for voting.

Chairman Oakley stated to the group he wanted to start a process as the Commission goes through its business, and to adopt the Legislative process for doing votes. He stated that if the Commission has a matter before them he wants to do a voice vote. He said that the Chair will ask how the commission wants to vote. “Short Form” means the commission will do a voice vote. He said that if anyone that is a voting member of the Commission wants a roll call, they just say “Roll Call” and roll will be taken verbally.

Chairman Oakley asked if there was anyone, who in the course of this meeting, who wants to comment on an agenda item? Chairman Oakley noted he knew Karla Hansen would have an item with Mollie Anderson. He also mentioned he was aware of the item at 11:00am – and that the Motor Truck Association will want to make comments and that they will have that opportunity.

Approval of Minutes of July 18, 2007 Meeting

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved with minor corrections.

Chairman Oakley noted the minutes are in a different format; this is as a result of meeting with staff. Staff was asked to do a summary that could be done in a few pages. This would allow the commissioners to see to see the kinds of things that were discussed and action items. Thereafter, Nancy Williams has completed some very thorough minutes. Chairman Oakley said that this is to memorialize what the commission has done in case they need to go back and take a look at what they were thinking or the presentation that was made.

Page Nine – correction to the spelling of M. J. Dolan

Page Two & Five – the correct spelling of Molly Clause is “Molly”

Hearing no other changes or corrections, the minutes stand approved as submitted.

Staff Reports/Project Updates

Dean Ibsen presented a Power Point to the group, with photos of some of the work going on at the Capitol Complex presently.

East Steps of the Capitol

Dean stated that construction is underway and that the steps have been removed. He said they are creating a space below the steps for some electrical equipment. He stated that this will allow them to move equipment out of the sub-basement of the Capitol into the electrical vault. Part of this project is funded from Capitol Interior – Exterior funding and part of the project is funded from the Electrical Distribution project. He further stated that the work is well underway, and that there is currently there a “cap” over the equipment room below and the stone steps that will be installed.

Windows on the East side of the Capitol

Dean stated that scaffolding is back, and that work on windows of the East side of the Capitol has begun. He said that the work on the Capitol started in 1983 and at that time the windows were restored, now in 2007 we are once again restoring the windows. Dean said that this suggests to us, if we had routine maintenance money that we could have been using all along, we may have been able to save some of the costs for the window repairs. He stated that this work on the windows will complete the windows on the West Side and East Side of the building, part of that is a factor on how the sun hits the building. He said that these are not manufactured windows; we are restoring the windows that are there.

Parking Lot Work

Dean said that the lot east of the Hoover Building (Lot # 1) has been finished, and that (Lot 2) is almost finished. He also said that the lot South of the Hoover Building (South of Court Avenue) (Lot # 3), is underway, and that the contractor is coming back to do more work since the satisfaction level is not that high. Lot # 19 (East of the Capitol), is completed. Dean said as part of the Lot #19 project, there will be a walk-way which is ADA compliant and that will allow for people to go from the Capitol to the Lucas Building rather than traversing the parking lots. He stated that work on Lot # 14 (East of the Capitol (SE Corner) is just beginning and in Lot # 6, South of East Walnut near the monument area – the West side of the lot is nearly completed and the East side work will begin. He said that this lot is to be concrete and in conformance with the Master Plan in terms of the layout of the lot.

Newly Funded Construction Projects

Tunnel Improvements—Dean said that is \$260,000 to start a study of the tunnels; and he believes, ultimately that what they will need to repair the tunnels is a rough estimate cost of \$20 to \$30 million dollars. He stated that they have a budgeted amount of \$26 million dollars.

Hoover Building—Dean said that the Hoover building was constructed in 1978 and that DAS is replacing the pneumatic control systems which control the heating, ventilating and air conditioning.

Chiller Replacement for the Central Energy Plant—Dean said this work will be starting soon.

Electrical Distribution Project

Dean stated that this has been an on-going project, and that replacing the electrical distribution system around the Complex includes the installation of generators. He said that there will be moving of the electrical equipment from the basement of the Lucas Building outside.

Switchgear South of the Lucas Building

Dean stated that there are three pieces of equipment about 5' x 5' and about 40" tall, and that they will be located on the South side of the Lucas Building. Dean Ibsen described the area, showing some photos. He said the original plan was to put one piece of equipment in the area but they looked at the project, they realized there were other pieces of equipment in the basement and penthouse that should be moved in terms of functionality and maintaining the equipment. Dean said that this is where they believe the equipment should be. Dean Ibsen advised the reason for moving the equipment from the basement was for safety, water in the basement, etc.

MOTION—Senator McCoy moved that DAS pursue options with Brian Clark & Associates and come back with some sort of recommendation, if it exceeds some amount to be determined, otherwise move forward with it. What is the amount? He asked that DAS pursue and explore all the options available to it. Chairman Oakley noted that a Commissioner has to make the motion. Molly Clause moved to make no specific recommendations but to defer to DAS to take into consideration what we have discussed today. Carl Voss seconded the motion. Molly Clause asked for a vote by Short Form. Motion carried.

New Office Buildings

Dean Ibsen provided brief updates on the new office building projects.

New Office Building/Mercy Capitol Acquisition

Dean Ibsen stated DAS has been meeting with the consultants, Substance Architecture. Dean hopes that preliminary planning with the users can begin in early September on space requirements. He said at this point, what they are looking at is Mercy Capitol and how that fits into the equation.

Director Anderson stated DAS is anxious to begin the design phase of the new State Office Building and bring back somewhere between 1,000 and 1,200 state employees back on Campus. This would also replace the Wallace Building, house the Department of Agriculture and Department of Natural Resources and bring back tenants who are in leased space somewhere else in Polk County back onto the Campus. She said the Mercy Capitol facility is for sale, given the fact they have been given a favorable decision on their request to build a hospital out West, they have made the decision that they want to sell the Hospital. She stated that they had been in negotiations with Mercy Capitol for over a year regarding that space. Whatever agreement we come to will not occur until the end of 2009 when Mercy Capitol will be in their new facility.

Director Anderson advised after meetings with the design team, that they feel the number one location for the new office building is the north side of the campus. The north campus would then include the new office building, Jessie Parker Building, IWD and the Ola Babcock Miller Building.

She stated that they had reached a tentative agreement with Mercy Capitol with a \$6 million dollar offer for about a 9.5 acre site, which is what the whole site represents, all the way to SE 14th Street. It would be surrounded by 14th Street, Des Moines Street and East 12th Street. She went on to say that they had recently learned is that Mercy Capitol is only willing to sell a portion of the 9.5 acres because they are trying to reach an agreement with Ladco. Ladco is a medical professional building which is located close by. There are some doctors in the Ladco Building that would like to remain. The land is for sale underneath it but someone else owns the building and now they have expressed they have some interest in exercising an option to buy the land underneath. Director Anderson said, at this point, Mercy Capitol has not made a final decision, what that means is that they are only willing to sell, at this point in time, the hospital, the ground underneath it and the block across the street which we plan to use for parking.

Director Anderson started that DAS has been trying to negotiate a price, and that the reason they want to get a closure on this deal is that it is very important to design. She said they don't want to find themselves designing a space assuming that they can purchase Mercy Capitol and then having to transfer to some other area because that doesn't work out. They have been trying to finalize this decision and arrive at a price they think is fair. \$6 million dollars is the price they were willing to sell DAS the 9.5 acres, at this point in time the price tag is unacceptable to the State. She stated that DAS is in negotiations and that they are doing due diligence to insure that whatever offer we make on the property can be supported by appraisals. The hospital itself has many functional purposes which could house state employees, could offer storage facilities, a cafeteria, a wellness facility for employees, a portion of it could be used for a pharmacy for state employees, etc. She said she still wants to be able to cash-flow this without an appropriation so they are in the process of double checking financial documents and insuring that the purchase makes sense.

With the possibility that DAS may not reach an agreement, they are also asking the design firm to begin looking at what would happen if they had to locate it only on the property they own at the current time. The modifications that they would require, means that the garage would go from perhaps the back of the building and two to three stories to a five parking garage to the back. It would also increase the height of the building, if we were only able to build on the land that we own at the current time. She said that DAS is evaluating those costs; however, and that they are hopeful that they will still be able to reach an agreement with Mercy Capitol.

Mercy Capitol has said numerous times that they have not made the decision to sell it to the other party, they simply cannot make a decision now until they have a chance to determine what happens with the Lutheran Hospital and other things on this campus end. Director Anderson stated that if DAS needs an answer in the next couple weeks, the answer is that they are not ready to sell the full parcel of land to DAS but they are willing to sell a portion of it, which is roughly 4.17 acres. We are trying to agree on a price. One of DAS' concerns about the Hospital is that they have taken away the parking which is to the back of it which would not be sold to DAS at this point. We need to make certain in whatever DAS does in this facility can work in concert with the parking garage that will be built.

Representative Watts stated he thought this was pretty much a done deal on a lease-purchase arrangement on the Mercy Capitol Building and what Director Anderson is saying now is that it is not a done deal.

Director Anderson stated Mercy Capitol is only willing, at this point in time, to negotiate on the sale of the hospital itself, the block it sits on and the block across the street which represents 4.7 acres. She said they are checking the financials to ensure the cash flow.

Representative Watts asked how this is different from what the Commission heard two months ago.

Director Anderson stated the difference is they thought DAS would be acquiring the whole 9.5 acres which included all the way to 14th Street and this would be only half of that. The doctors building on the property (the hospital owns the land) and the clinic building is owned by Ladco, a development company here in Polk County. Their lease was a lease that allowed them to be charged \$6,000 per year for the land, which is a very favorable deal for the doctors in the building. The doctors would like to stay in this location and expand the clinic. Mercy Capitol has made no final decisions and are saying they are not going to make any change in the agreement they have with Ladco until they have more information about what is going to happen in this area.

Chairman Oakley asked what the time frame is for the State with regard to when these negotiations have to be resolved so that you know what you have, in order to proceed with the state office building. Director Anderson stated we need to make a decision within the next thirty days otherwise we are really beginning to impact the design schedule which would increase the cost of the new state office building.

Director Anderson stated the alternative site for the new state office building, if we don't work this out would be 14th and Grand and the congestion created on that corner for Grand and the exit right off the Interstate would be considerable. Director Anderson stated the Master Plan had a building site; however, one of the things that has changed about the Master Plan is that the area we thought would be available back to the Interstate has changed, we cannot build all of the way back to the Interstate since there is a "no build" area back to the Interstate. Unfortunately, the Master Plan reflected there was a good deal of land and it is no longer buildable.

IUB/OCA Building Update

Dean Ibsen stated we are underway with preliminary design, the architects have met with the users. All of the users came in, advised the architects their needs, hopes, desires and wishes. We talked about energy efficiency issues, geo-thermal, all kinds of issues associated with energy related to the building. We brought in maintenance staff, Mid-America was present, and we had a 3-4 hour session on those issues. The architects tell us the next thing we will be looking at all the budget issues. One of the next issues we have to deal with is the site, the fill that we have, we are geo-technical assessment of the site. We are hoping at the October meeting we will have an action item related to the site and the preliminary site selection and probably some concept issues that we can talk about. This project is moving ahead.

Dean advised contracts are in place with BNIM Architects, we are still finalizing negotiations with Substance Architecture for the new state office building.

Molly Clause stated this building would be a showcase for Renewable Energy. Dean advised this would be an energy efficient building noting energy efficient does not necessarily mean

LEED certified. There is no Legislative requirement for the building to be LEED certified; however, we are certainly looking at that. The new state office building does have a requirement for us to look at the possibility of LEED Silver certification. IUB/OCA is intended to be a model for municipalities, municipal utilities, other entities that could come in and look at it and want to build a similar building.

Chairman Oakley stated, going back to the new state office building – you stated you have about 30 days and then you were going to start doing design work because you are going to know whether you have Mercy Capitol or not. There are some very fundamental decisions yet to be made with regard to that site which are going to influence design, i.e. vacation of streets and a lot of things are going to need to be done and noted it probably wouldn't be prudent to get to far down the design stage without discussing the "footprint" of that the building and the ramp and how that is going to be configured, the package that it is going to look like. This is a very fundamental recommendation for the Commission to be making, since this will set this campus for the a very long time. For the record, all Commission members are going to want to be on the "front end of the decision" and not be handed options that are sort of taken for granted. Chairman Oakley noted even if the Commission has to meet extra in order to meet a timeframe, the Commission will make that commitment.

Director Anderson noted that Chairman Oakley has really identified a key issue for the future of the Master Plan, this will be the biggest change to the Master Plan in a long period of time. It was also noted that the vacation of the streets is an issue that will have to come before the Commission as well.

West Capitol Terrace

Dean Ibsen provided an update on upcoming phases of the West Capitol Terrace project.

Phase 2 Update—Dean Ibsen advised we have received \$1.6 million dollars for Phase Two work. Phase one was the "core", phase two is the gardens and the monuments and some of the outlying areas. We are moving ahead with the design and preparing to go to bid on that project. From the Planning Commission's standpoint, we have received the approvals we need. Unless there is substantive change to the design or to the work we are doing, other than providing you with ongoing updates, we are not looking for any more action items on Phase Two.

Phase Three—A number of issues require further discussion including the fountain. There are a number of issues going on around the west side of the west side of the West Capitol Terrace.

Director Anderson noted with the first phase that is completed, I hope you had a chance to look at the recent article about the West Capitol Terrace and Matt Carlile, noting it was a very nice article. Nancy Williams is in charge of rental of the use of state facilities, West Capitol Terrace has become a destination place for some weddings which is a good sign it has been received well by the public. Issues related to some of the trees planted on Arbor Day, some did not make it through the hot summer and will be replaced. Phase Two, nothing has changed about the plans laid out to you, it is just the outer design of the avenue created and now we are really beginning to think about Phase Three. Phase Three, the base of it which is the end of Locust Street, has the three properties at the base of the hill and has the map of the state of Iowa (geographically presented correctly).

The Master Plan for the park had included an area at the base of the West Capitol Terrace, impacted by that is the three buildings, 707, 711 and 709 East Locust. We have acquired 709 which is the Row House. We have had an examination of it, there are people who would like to rent it; however, it doesn't have approval from the Fire Department to allow us to use it. The Community College Building is on the agenda later on today, it is our desire to agree to an exchange of that property for a one acre site on Court Avenue next to the Iowa Motor Truck Association. It is our method of acquiring that for a price tag really \$442,000 in exchange for a \$632,000 piece of property, with the understanding that they had to accept about \$190,000 worth of restrictive covenants which prohibit them from using or selling that for a variety of things and allow the Capitol Planning Commission to review their design of their building. They can't sell it without giving the State the First Right of Refusal, they can't modify it and they have to build a building which is something that would be acceptable to this Committee.

The last building is 711 E. Locust is owned by the Schooner Corporation, it has been before the Executive Council twice. The Executive Council is made up of the Secretary of State, the Governor, the Auditor, the Treasurer and the Secretary of Agriculture. They have reviewed and we have made one last attempt through the Attorney General's office to get access to the facility for an appraisal and to bring in another independent appraiser to that facility. We have received approval from them to get access to the facility, they have completed their appraisal. I would expect the Executive Council will have another appraisal to look at in terms of what the value of the 711 East Locust property is.

If all three properties are acquired, the desire would be to tear down those, which would be consistent with the Master Plan of the 3rd phase of the park. It would create two grand entrance features to the park. One that would come off of Locust Street with two huge entrance features and the burned wall area which would allow for a seating area in addition to the courtyard to the side.

We have had conversations with the Iowa State Fair about having concession stands in that area and they have agreed that they would be willing to work on the design of that area.

Paul Carlson provided figures of how we came to the cost for the Community College land. The ground was appraised at \$632,000, the restrictive covenants are worth about \$190,000 plus they are giving us \$75,000 cash. The appraised value of the building is \$370,000 – when you apply the \$190,000 and the \$75,000 cash, it ends up being \$370,00 and \$367,000 so it is very close.

Representative Watts stated you wouldn't demolish the other two buildings we have until a decision is made on the 3rd building. Director Anderson stated that is correct, noting there is some debate about whether they are connecting walls or not. Until we own the building, we want to be absolutely certain we wouldn't be creating a liability for the State in tearing down the other two properties.

Molly Clause asked if we were in a time crunch with the three buildings. Director Anderson noted we had a request for an appropriation for the 3rd phase of the park, at that point in time, if we are not going to acquire that building, the design would change which could affect the price. We are at a critical point in our negotiations and I believe in talking with the Attorney General's

office that they expect that by the end of next week, then the Executive Council could meet on the issue again.

Chairman Oakley asked about angle parking on Finkbine Street noting there was not an action item. On what phase is that being considered? Matt Carlile stated that was part of the Phase Two plan. Dean Ibsen stated that was part of the concept plan and this has been approved. Paul Carlson stated that concept was originally approved when the general schematic for the West Capitol Terrace was approved.

Director Anderson discussed Phase 3 and the Fountain, noting the fountain is being asked for as a part of next year's appropriation request. There is a committee of Capitol Planning Commissioners that is chaired by Cathy Brown. The Committee is exploring the fountain options. Director Anderson noted there are many people who believe that we need a very powerful fountain as a part of the West Capitol Park, the expected cost at this point in time is about \$1 million dollars. This Committee is exploring possible designs of the fountain and noted there are people who are interested in contributing to a fountain. Director Anderson stated she believed we needed to ask for a "place holder" appropriation request; however, we should also entertain discussions with people about raising money for the fountain. We believe there is interest in this, as long as it does not include "naming rights".

Karla Hansen with Caring Connections – the peace community in Des Moines spoke to the group. Ms. Hansen stated her group wants the fountain to be a showcase. Ms. Hansen noted that she and Rev. Chet Guinn met with Jerry Addy to just begin the process about how to go about putting a monument to peace makers somewhere on the state grounds. Ms. Hansen stated her organization believes they can raise the \$1 million dollars for the fountain within one year.

Rev. Chet Guinn stated Iowa has a tremendous history of peace making – this could be a monument to Iowans, past, present and future who contribute to the peace of the world.

Director Anderson noted we do not want to put additional monuments on the Complex until we have a Monument Plan, there is already something in the works to have this. Additionally, there has not been any discussion about whether this is the appropriate entity to sponsor the fountain, we need to have that discussion.

Chairman Oakley noted the previous Commission Chair had appointed Scott Brown and Cathy Brown to serve as a Committee to look at Monuments. Chairman Oakley asked that Karla Hansen and Rev. Chet Guinn talk with this committee. (Scott Brown & Cathy Brown on the Fountain Committee – the Monument is Cathy Brown & Carl Voss)

Visitors' Center

Director Anderson provided an update on the proposed Visitors' Center for the complex.

Director Anderson noted there has been considerable discussion as we have tried to acquire the three properties at the base of the hill, as we have looked at the Carriage House and whether that would be an appropriate place for a visitors' center. Discussions with various groups has drawn us to the Historical Building as being the proper place for a visitors center. At the last Commission meeting we presented conceptual drawings, a vision center which would be a glass box added on to the Historical Building. We have engaged, through a donation covering the

architectural fee, of some drawings of that area and we are beginning to meet with interested parties who want to support or contribute to the development of a visitors center in that area. It is only conceptual at this point in time, we are not planning to ask for any appropriation related to this. If you go to the Historical Building Terrace and think about the view you have in front of you, it only takes one visit to look at the West Capitol Terrace and the Capitol and realize that is the correct location for the visitors center.

Chairman Oakley stated at this point, particularly to the Legislators, a lot of what we have talked about up to this point, parking lots and infrastructure items, but the willingness to appropriate routine maintenance funds to create some funding that takes care of stuff now so it doesn't cost a lot down the road is really showing up already. DAS is able to do some maintenance and some multi-year planning, if there is a message to take back, those dollars aren't high visibility things but they are really important and it shows up in the things going on here.

Capitol Complex Master Plan

The need for an update to the Capitol Complex Master Plan was discussed.

Chairman Oakley stated a master plan has to be up-to-date, it has to make sense to people, we welcome a background of this and staff recommendations.

Dean Ibsen distributed a "hand-out", and discussed this. In 1998 we completed a Strategic Parking Management Plan at a cost of \$53,000. The Master Plan also started at a cost of \$365,000 with the Master Plan being approved in April 2000.

There is a piece that says "we shall consider the guidelines of the Master Plan for any improvements on Complex" (not distributed). There is also information the historical character of the Capitol building and the State Capitol View Protection. There is a view protection ordinance within the City of Des Moines that must be complied with.

We believe we need an update of the Master Plan. We have a request for \$250,000, we believe we can do some good work with that amount. Some of the things we need to look at include:

- All of the changes which have already taken place including maps, conceptual information about the Complex
- Staffing, square footage, existing square footage, projected square footage, parking, existing parking and projected parking
- Further development of the site implementation – the details. The Master Plan was general, saying you needed to look at site implementation detail. At this time we have a contract with Brian Clark & Associates to help us on a project-by-project basis for those details
- Monument Plan
- Develop new recommendations for the various districts (North, West, South, East, Central and Capitol area)
- Other issues to be determined

Bill Dikis commented one of the things he has worked on with the Capitol Planning Commission and the City several years ago was the collaboration between the City of Des Moines and the State in establishing the view corridor protection.

Scott Brown suggested in the new office building will set the boundaries and the look and feel of the north campus for the next 100 years, it would be nice if the Master Plan, particularly the north campus part of the Master Plan, could be done prior to any commitments as to citing the new building, etc. Dean Ibsen stated he has talked to Substance Architecture about looking at the north complex, more than just the building. The level of detail, we are not sure yet, but we realize we need to look at Mercy Capitol, the existing parking structure, the Wallace Building, Carriage House and how all of that ties together.

Cathy Brown also encouraged that some of the “way-finding”, how people get from the interstate to other downtown areas, parking areas, destinations.

Chairman Oakley stated every ten years the Commission should have a good look at the Master Plan and go through a significant examination.

Capitol Complex Monuments

An update on monuments was provided along with discussion on a proposed monuments policy.

Shattering Silence

Director Anderson stated the last time we had a discussion about a location on the Capitol Complex. There was discussion that many people felt that other locations should be considered. We believe the location of the “Shattering Silence” should be placed by the Judicial Building because it is a story about justice. We offered four different sites presented to the group, all of which was of interest to them except one site. Director Anderson stated no final decision has been made regarding the site yet, noting we will want to visit with the Judicial Branch with regard to these sites. Dean Ibsen pointed out on a map the four sites in discussion. Chairman Oakley advised this will be an Action Item at the October meeting.

Workers Monument

Jerry Addy noted today the group is asking for the ability to start construction prior to the next meeting subject to satisfactory negotiations on the 28E Agreement with the State of Iowa. The group will be signing a contract today with the artist, Brian Clark & Associates have done the landscaping. Anticipated completion date – installation of the Sculpture on April 24, 2008 and have a dedication on April 28, 2008. April 28, 2008 is Workers Memorial Day, the Committee has said they would like the monument done for this event.

MOTION—Chairman Oakley moved that the Commission recommend proceeding with the site construction work. Part of the 28E Agreement would be that the State staff and Brian Clark & Associates staff would work together on the plan details of the site plan. Molly Clause seconded the motion. Vote – short form has been called for. Motion carried.

Monuments Master Plan Update

Chairman Oakley noted that the Master Plan requires we have a Monuments Policy, currently we do not have one. We have a committee of Carl Voss & Cathy Brown appointed last meeting to go over this matter. We requested staff produce some best practices examples from other states in order for us to develop some specific criteria.

Nicholas Smith discussed a document he created with a link to websites for other Capitol Planning Commissions as well as links for states that have Capitol Restoration projects. The most significant site found thus far was for the State of Idaho. Nick also attached a copy of Iowa's current Capitol Monuments, Memorials and Historical Markers which includes a map. We plan to create criteria and guideline to ensure we have written plan when people ask about the possibility of placing monuments and memorials on the Capitol Complex grounds. The document is a rough draft, we will continue to do more research and provide this to the Commission at a later time.

Chairperson Oakley noted the Commission would like to have this as an Action Item at the October meeting. Cathy Brown noted the Idaho information was really physical planning, it didn't address how you evaluate (other than no individual should be recognized), it doesn't address eligibility or other criteria for which of monuments would be considered. Chairman Oakley noted the Commission needs a "bigger universe" of examples of actual monuments and memorial criteria.

Molly Clause asked if we were going to take advantage of the Iowa Arts Council for input on this. Chairperson Oakley noted part of the elements of these is always the public art nature. Bruce Williams from the Department of Cultural Affairs will be brought in to this process, when we develop criteria, we are going to ask for his view on this.

Dean Ibsen advised he has notebooks regarding monuments. In 2002 we did an assessment of the monuments on the Capitol Complex, recommendations on repair needs, ongoing maintenance needs. A number of the repairs have been completed. The notebooks also talks about some of the history of some of the monuments.

Capitol Requests/Five Year Modernization Plan for the Capitol Complex

The Dept. of Administrative Services' proposed Five Year Plan to be submitted was reviewed. Dean Ibsen noted everyone should have a 3-page handout "Preliminary FY2009 5-Year Plan for Dept. of Administrative Services". Dean Ibsen advised we have met with the Department of Management giving them a description of the projects we are requesting. We have briefly discussed this with the Capitol Planning Commission in July, we have talked briefly with the Vertical Infrastructure Advisory Committee about some of DAS' requests as well as some of the requests from other agencies. This document summarizes the FY08 appropriations that we already have as well as our requests for FY09 thru FY13. The document also includes our draft ranking of these requests which is very close to our rankings last year as well as what we talked about at our July meeting.

We are refining the offer descriptions over the next two to three weeks, they will then be submitted to the Department of Management on October 1, 2007. The Department of Management has a process of teams that review the various offers, the Vertical Infrastructure Committee meets in October, they look at the requests from DAS as well as the other eleven agencies that the Vertical Infrastructure Committee works with, they make recommendations to the Governor based on their vision of maintaining and repairing existing buildings. The Governor makes his recommendations to the Legislature in January and the Legislature then goes through the process of appropriations.

Chairman Oakley requested another opportunity to look at this document at our October meeting. DAS is asking the Capitol Planning Commission to comment and to pass on the document presented at this time.

Dean Ibsen talked to the Commission about the new items added to the list:

- Fire Protection for Facilities Management Center - \$300,000
We have fire protection systems throughout the Complex, we are replacing some fire alarm systems in buildings. This building does not even have a fire hydrant in the vicinity.
- 1200 Ton Chiller for IWD/North Campus - \$1,500,000
The chiller equipment located east of Workforce Development – that equipment currently cools the Capitol and Workforce Development.
- Install New Heating Coils for the Lucas Building - \$300,00
The Lucas Building was built in 1950, there was a major renovation of the building in 1998-1999-2000 over a period of time. What we have found over time is that there are some heating coils in the Lucas Building needing to be replaced.
- Capitol Complex Master Plan Update - \$250,00
We have talked about this.
- GIS System Drawings, Electronic Media - \$300,000
GIS (Geographical Information System), is an electronic system for recording and documents of all of the components of a building or site. Currently we have electronic documents of various kinds. We would like to consolidate all that information using GIS. We have talked with IT, they have suggested we talk with the Department of Transportation so that in terms of “economy of scale” we can utilize the system in place.
- West Capitol Terrace – currently we have Phase Three in FY09, we did have the fountain in FY10, we may want to talk about including everything in FY09. We may want to talk about including some design component of the fountain in FY09.

Chairman Oakley commented on the fountain about doing some plumbing and some conceptual work so that you can then work with the private sector. We might want to consider some kind of a challenge appropriation in 2010, it wouldn't affect the current budget you are going to be working on but you could indicate some level of support. This would indicate there was some legislative priority down the road.

Director Anderson noted the request is a reflection of the fact that we are not certain that we would find donors who would be willing to build the Fountain without naming rights. Representative Watts noted he assumed we would be open to acknowledging contributions somehow (without naming rights), to those who are willing to make contributions. Chairman Oakley stated this will depend on what type of criteria the Commission works out. Cathy Brown noted one of the challenges is, you treat it as another “monument”.

Scott Brown asked how far down in the rankings the Capitol Master Plan is located noting he would like to see this item moved closer to the top of the rankings.

Chairman Oakley stated he would be more comfortable looking at this document in October after receiving more information from staff. Dean Ibsen offered one possibility, noting the ranking we

have done, we have to think about “health, life, safety” issues, what are the most urgent projects do we need to deal with, this is pretty much how we rank these projects. Dean suggested that the Capitol Planning Commission look at the projects on the list that are “near and dear to your hearts”, that meet the mission of the Capitol Planning Commission’s charge and based on that, which of these projects relate to what you are doing and what is the priority order that you see. You could rank them in October and include them in your Annual Report in January.

Iowa Association of Community College Trustees (IACCT) Building

IACCT presented design concepts for the proposed building.

Chairman Oakley shared with the Commission the e-mail he sent to the Commission, “It is appropriate that I remind the Commission and DAS that I will, as I did at the July 18, 2007 meeting, continue to reclude myself from participating in any process or proceeding involving IACCT acquisition and development of this subject property. I have instructed DAS to omit me from any communications concerning this matter not otherwise made public, I have asked DAS to advise Iowa Motor Truck Association of the time and place of this agenda item to be considered. I will also turn over my duties as presiding Chair to Vice-Chair Cathy Brown when we reach this matter on the agenda. I am taking this action to avoid any appearance of favoritism or suggestion of a conflict of interest as IACCT is one of my firm’s clients.” In view of this, I am not going to ask Cathy Brown, as Vice Chair, conduct the proceedings with regard to this item.

Vice Chair Cathy Brown noted there are Commissioners that have commitments toward the end of the hour so we would like to conduct this business within the timeframe we have allotted.

M. J. Dolan, Executive Director for the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees, thanked the Commission for having this meeting and inviting IACCT to it. Ms. Dolan reminded Commissioners IACCT met with the Capitol Planning Commission last month and the Commission approved the site plan. Ms. Dolan stated today IACCT is here to talk about external appearance of the building. Ms. Dolan thanked the DAS staff and the Capitol Planning Commission for all of their assistance in working on this over the last couple of years to get to this point noting they are very much looking forward to being a good neighbor.

Ms. Dolan introduced the Durrant Architects Engineers, Don Seymour will be speaking and Christopher Osore will be running the slides. Mr. Seymour thanked the Commission for their time and wanted to recap what was discussed at the last meeting (attached hand-out), and a Power Point presentation today.

Mr. Seymour recapped the goals that were set for this project:

- We want it to be build for Today and the Future
- We want it to be “Timeless”, not “Opulent”
- We want it to serve as a gallery to showcase each college’s talent
- We want it to Compliment the Capitol Complex

Mr. Seymour discussed the site plan, floor plan, elevations and schedule for the project (PowerPoint presentation). (Copy to be a part of the minutes). It was also noted this will be a LEED project, they will be using a lot of materials that will be qualifying for that project.

Director Anderson advised at this point in time we have not signed an agreement between the Community College Association and the State regarding the exchange of this property. We are ready to do that, we have reviewed that with all the necessary people. We have worked with the Community College Association to allow for them to have access to the facility for the purposes of surveying, their geo-thermal testing, etc. We believe we have vetted this appropriately through the Legislative body, we have notified them of our intent to exchange this on a number of different occasions, that it has been properly reviewed and that we believe it is critical to our work on the West Capitol Terrace in terms of acquiring the property and that we have responded to the citizens desire to prove that we have exchanged like value properties. The Executive Council has approved this on two occasions, it has been reviewed with them and the exchange has been approved. We have been finalizing the agreement from the perspective that if their building is not done on time, they are going to be allowed to stay in their location on East 7th, that if it is not done in October, where we are going on the agreement was related to the price of the rent that they would pay should it not be completed on time. We felt that it was important for us to be able to give them a deadline to work with. It is my understanding they met with the Motor Truck Association this morning. Yesterday the Iowa Motor Truck Association and the Governor's office met to review some of their concerns about the location of the facility next to theirs and my hope is that today's discussion will resolve some of those concerns. The Iowa Motor Truck Association had requested that we cancel this agenda item today and place it on a future one, we thought it was important for you to hear the discussion today. It is our hope that the Commission will ask any questions that you might have about the work that has been done to date and be comfortable with the effort we are making to proceed and if you do not, give us clear guidance as to what we should do related to the agreement. At this point in time, we do have agreement from the Executive Council to proceed on the exchange and we have followed all of the requirements necessary for us to do that according to the law. If there are issues between the future owner of this site and the Iowa Motor Truck Association, it is our hope that they will be able to find a way to work those issues out.

Dean Ibsen stated he has met with IACCT and talked with them about the design, we think it is a good design. Mr. Seymour stated they have been able to keep 10 of the 17 trees on the site noting that we would lose the trees located on the South and East corners. M.J.Dolan advised with the Community Colleges having landscaping programs throughout the State, they are going to involve the students in helping us lay out the site and they have talked with Brian Clark & Associates to help with an overview so that we can keep the continuity that reflect the State's wishes.

Director Anderson noted with the Restricted Covenants, any modifications of this building in the future require them to come back to the Capitol Planning Commission to discuss.

Dan Manning, an attorney with the Connolly Law Firm, stated he was going to be speaking on behalf of the Iowa Motor Truck Association. Scott Weiser, Executive Director of the Iowa Motor Truck Association is also going to speak to the Commissioners today.

Mr. Manning stated he appreciated the opportunity to address the Capitol Planning Commission. Mr. Manning stated the Iowa Motor Truck Association, as the neighbor to this particular property, fairly late in the game – as in we met yesterday with Charlie Krogmeier, Mollie Anderson and others and saw the site plan for the first time yesterday. Mr. Manning pointed out

the frustration they feel in terms of what has transpired, we have no problem with or dispute with the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees, their property is at the end of Locust Street and they are going to be displaced. Mr. Manning noted he had been involved in many displaced property owners stating that he understands the frustration and the problems that come up when the government needs your property for a project and you need to look to another location.

Mr. Manning stated from the perspective of the Iowa Motor Truck Association, we see this entire transaction as a matter of expediency. In other words, this is an opportunity to take a parcel of land that is a part of the Capitol Complex that was never anticipated for development – we feel it is your responsibility to guard and maintain the Complex, we see this as not the appropriate way to deal with the Complex property. This is part of the Master Plan. We start our analysis, why if these good folks must be displaced why we must carve out a part of the Capitol Complex. We recognize that we don't know that this particular body is prepared to overturn the decision of the Executive Council, we want to be clear with the Commission that you need to take the time to focus upon what is actually going to happen to this property. What is its configuration, what is its elevation, since we are so close to this property I would recommend that at some point the Commission members go and take a look at that particular property, there are a number of challenges which I know IACCT and their experts is going to address. In that process, we want to ensure that it is the best developed site that it can be.

We see this matter is moving forward very quickly, as Mollie Anderson mentioned, there is no signed deal, there are negotiations back and forth, they may have a genuine idea as to what they want to do, but from our perspective, we are asking the Commission to ask those questions. Where is that building going to be located, what kind of views are going to be allowed for both the Iowa Motor Truck Association and for the Trustees. From our perspective, we think this matter is moving forward simply to quickly. We have been involved in this matter for about 24 hours so in terms of what we know about the specifics, we have some concerns. We appreciate the opportunity to be here and share our concerns which start from Step One – why are we trading property on the Capitol Complex, if we don't have a finalized deal, does that need to happen? These folks deserve fair compensation for the taking of their property but should this happen? If this is going forward, the Iowa Motor Truck Association would like to be a part of that process, we had a meeting today with members of the Trustees, we hope we can work these things out that we can come to some understanding. The trees, the grading, the triangular nature of this site are all concerns that I don't know if they have been thoroughly analyzed and we ask that you consider some of those items before you make any final decisions.

Scott Weiser thanked the Commission for the opportunity to come before the group and to follow-up on this. Mr. Weiser stated they purchased the building twelve years ago, the act of raising the money, designing our building and building it was the best thing that ever happened to the Iowa Motor Truck Association. Our building is a source of tremendous pride in not only operating the building, but putting it together and making it happen. We have been a major east side supporter. Mr. Weiser stated the Commission is the bulwark against expediency, particularly when you are dealing with an irreplaceable asset the State owns. You are here to stop these quick deals, that is why you are appointed. We simply are not interested in having that area developed, there is nothing signed, there is plenty of opportunity for renegotiation, there are other opportunities to work on grants and other things that may be pending that are driving

this decision. If it is the right thing and there is no other choice, we need to be consulted – it would be important that you work with neighbors – we saw this yesterday. In a normal zoning situation, we would have been called or notified and other neighbors would have been notified and we would have had all the opportunities to get here before this date. We are asking that no decision be made today so we have a chance to explore options. We own other property next to our building, there may some things that we can do to lessen the impact of this building. Very frankly, this puts traffic about 15' from the edge of the building and it puts what looks to me like a three story building looking right into us. That building is pushed as far as it can be to the West, we could put two more buildings between that spot and the hill right now – plenty of space over there. Those mature trees that come down, those are the ones that guard our property, those seven are the ones that are important to us. We are asking to lets stand down from this and give us an opportunity to work with the Community College Trustees, if this project has to go forward we want some input on how that building works. Mr. Weiser stated this project will take extensive fills and cuts, and putting the parking right on our doorstep. Certainly, we would like to have input it. Secondly, if this property was for sale people would be interested in it, certainly the piece in front of our building. Parking location discussed.

A representative with IACCT noted the building was placed as far East as they were allowed to go with the property given to us by the State, noting they have one acre. A request was made to the State about being more to the East, but we only have the one acre. Extensive cut and fill – Mr. Krausman noted that because of the LEED process, it is one of the requirements that we minimize the amount of dirt that we are moving and try to create the least amount of impact into the site. Grade and elevation discussed as well as parking issues.

Mr. Jeffrey Krausman, Dickinson Law Firm, attorney for IACCT noted we have been working on the project from a legal perspective for quite a long time, we are talking about having started these discussions in 2006. The only thing awaiting is the signature of the exchange agreement was to give the State the opportunity to come in and look at the property one more time to assess the proper rental value in the event that our construction didn't get done on schedule. We understand that things happen and it was necessary to have a contingency plan and so the State asked for the opportunity to come in and look at the building one more time to assess the rental value. That is the only reason there isn't anything "inked" on this deal. The time for negotiations has already been spent, there is a lot of man hours put into this project and we ask that the Commission continue to move forward on it.

Vice Chair Cathy Brown advised at the last Commission meeting on July 18, 2007, we approved the site plan so much of today's discussion is really in retrospect of action the Commission has already taken. Today's discussion was to review the architecture because at the last meeting the architecture was not advanced far enough for us to be comfortable with taking action on that. That doesn't mean we can't go back and re-evaluate our action of last time, but that would take a motion to do so.

Director Anderson responded to the question about why one acre, why not more land and that has to do with the statute that requires equal value exchange. That is the reason we limited them to one acre, they clearly wanted more than one acre and we would not agree to that without additional compensation.

Scott Brown stated he understood the one acre point and stated in his view it is unfortunate to lose State property that we are never going to get back. I understand we are gaining property for the Complex as well so there is a trade-off to be made and maybe this is the best trade-off that can be made. I appreciate the Restrictive Covenants that are being made, in looking at the drawings of the building, it is an attractive building. The value of the site is two-fold, the site is unique for two reasons; 1) proximity to the Capitol, 2) the view of the Capitol. The site has a value similar to a lake front property – from looking at the plans – this is like building a lake front building with no view of the lake – there is no windows facing the lake. I look at the Iowa Motor Truck Association building, but the views have to be awesome – that makes the building so much more valuable, makes better use of the land. I am not sure this design makes that good use of the land. Suggestions would be to move the building a little bit East or second change the parking lot – allow IACCT to use the Iowa Truckers Association parking lot and the proposed lot goes away. This topic discussed.

Scott Brown asked when the Iowa Truckers Association purchased the land, did you contact the State in any regard as far as protecting your view? They noted they went to Capitol Planning at the time, there was nothing contemplated for that space – we didn't know we were in jeopardy at any particular time or we would have been interested in that. It was noted their building was set up on the axis of the Capitol with glass. We were unaware that there was any need to protect that area out front or we would have acted on that.

Senator Seymour stated he would like to defer this vote until the next meeting. Could we give it another 60 days and let the two parties resolve some issues or is it imperative that we affirm our last months meeting. Director Anderson stated for the State it really doesn't create any problems except that if they don't meet their construction schedule, the opportunity to acquire the property at the time that we think we will acquire it which is October 2008, could be delayed which would mean that we would be in a landlord position which is not something the statute really provides for. IACCT noted it would be additional months of rent, the additional cost construction just in terms of starting later, having more Winter conditions to build through which is more expensive and there would be the cost of redesign. M. J. Dolan stated on behalf of the Iowa Association of Community College Trustees, we have spent a lot of time working on this plan, all of the Trustees reviewed this plan at their meeting on August 2, 2007, they will not be coming together for another year and were very pleased with the plan. On behalf of the Trustees, I would say we are very happy with our plan as they stand and would ask for the Commission to approve our external design today so that we can move forward and avoid rental costs, delayed construction costs and additional costs.

Representative Davitt discussed “virtual tours” which would give you a real sense of every aspect of this noting he would be curious to know if there was any interest in this.

Molly Clause asked about the timeline about when the Iowa Motor Truck Association knew about this plan. The Iowa Truckers Association noted they had no idea of this project until they saw transits on the property about a week ago. Director Anderson noted the issue has been discussed since January of 2006. With regard to whether we contacted the Iowa Motor Truck Association personally, the answer is no, we did not. It's been in the press, in the appropriate public forms but in retrospect, respect the neighbors, we could have done that better.

MOTION—Scott Brown moved to defer on this until the next meeting in October unless there was a need to schedule a special meeting before that. Molly Clause stated she was not comfortable in waiting that long. Motion died for lack of a second.

MOTION—Carl Voss moved to approve the architectural rendering as presented. Paul Carlson seconded the motion. Cathy Brown asked for clarification. Carl clarified that his motion does not address a change in the site plan; the site plan would stand approved and that the commission is recommending approval of the architecture. Director Anderson asked that the second not come from DAS staff but from another Commission member. Paul Carlson withdrew his second. Molly Clause seconded the motion with a friendly amendment asking the two parties to work together on this with a serious timeframe stipulation. Carl Voss noted he was okay with one week.

Senator McCoy asked if this is something that the Executive Council makes a decision on. Director Anderson stated the Executive Council has made a decision to authorize me to negotiate an agreement as long as it is “like value” and they have agreed on the methodology used to come up with the “like value”. Senator McCoy stated legislatively he has concerns about the process in terms of how a decision has been made to let a piece of State property go in exchange where one party to the adjoining property has been left completely out of the discussion. Senator McCoy stated he would not approve the design today.

Director Anderson stated there were nine times this was discussed with the Capitol Planning Commission, three times this was discussed with the Legislative body, two public hearings related to this issue (two articles), we duly followed all of the requirements of the law. That is the process we have to go through.

Scott Brown stated we are moving in the right direction and we have pretty close to a viable solution, but I would just like to take the extra days to make sure that we really have a win-win solution.

After some discussion, roll call vote. Motion carried.

Roll Call Vote:
Carl Voss—Yes
Molly Clause—Yes
Cathy Brown—Yes
Paul Carlson—Yes
Scott Brown—No
Brice Oakley—Abstain

It was noted there are three things being considered: 1) That the Commission go back and re-visit the site plan, which is really what the debate is about 2) Whether or not to approve the material and architectural style (which is really what today’s meeting is supposed to be about) 3) Is there an opportunity or is there a willingness of these parties to get together and see if they can modify the design in some way to be more accommodating to one another?

MOTION—Molly Clause moved to reconsider the previous motion. Paul Carlson seconded the motion. Roll call vote. Motion carried.

Roll Call Vote:
Scott Brown—Yes
Molly Clause—Yes
Paul Carlson—Yes
Cathy Brown—Yes
Brice Oakley—Abstain
Carl Voss—Absent

MOTION—Cathy Brown moved to reconvene between the 4th and the 11th of September for the purpose of consideration of this agenda item. Scott Brown seconded the motion. Roll call vote. Motion carried.

Adjourn

Since the meeting was running later than scheduled and Commission members had to leave, meeting adjourned with no other business discussed.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Williams, Secretary